

It is the first time I ever heard it was abhorred by Protestants, inasmuch as it was an opinion entertained by the Apostle St. Paul (but you do not always agree with the Apostle), 1 Cor. vii. 7, 24, 38, and even it would seem by our blessed Redeemer himself (Matt. xix. 12). That many of the ancient Church carried the opinion to an extravagant degree, there may be no doubt; still it is not opposed to, but in conformity with the teaching of Holy Scripture. You attempt to make it appear that Infant Baptism, originating in Africa, was chiefly confined to that country for a long time. You endeavor to prove this by stating that no Latin writer out of Africa makes mention of it as a practice till about the year 374 A. D., and, secondly, that "especially the Apostolical Constitutions" of the close of the third century, "make no allusion to Infant Baptism." I answer, first, by asking who are these Latin writers out of Africa from whom we should expect allusions to Infant Baptism? Secondly, that the silence of at least one Latin writer out of Africa proves incontestably the existence of Infant Baptism in Rome, at least, and consequently, in all Italy. There was in this very century a sharp controversy between Cyprian of Carthage and Stephen of Rome, on the subject of re-baptizing those who had been baptized by heretics; Cyprian contending that they ought to be, and Stephen that they ought not to be, if the due form had been observed of baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. (Eusebius, book vii. c. 3). But in this dispute there is not the least intimation whatever that there was the slightest dif-